

Kraig Gardner  
FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF EASTERN WASHINGTON AND IDAHO  
306 East Chestnut Avenue  
Yakima, Washington 98901  
(509) 248-8920

Attorneys for Defendant  
ANTHONY BOSWORTH

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
(UNASSIGNED MAGISTRATE JUDGE)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	PO-07-4002-JPH
Plaintiff,	)	CITATION NO. 1254877; 1254876
	)	
vs.	)	MEMORANDUM IN
	)	SUPPORT OF MOTION
ANTHONY BOSWORTH	)	TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO RULE 29
Defendant.	)	
	)	

The defendant, ANTHONY BOSWORTH, submits the following reply memorandum in support of his motion to dismiss pursuant to rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure:

**Procedural History**

Mr. Bosworth submits the following information in reply to the government's recitation of the facts. On January 18, 2007, the court presided over a bench trial involving three alleged traffic violations: Speeding, Expired Registration, and Failure to Obey. At the close of the Government's case, the Defendant timely moved to dismiss all three charges pursuant to Fed. R. Cr. Pro. 29. As to the speeding infraction, it is the defendant's position that the Government failed to produce sufficient admissible evidence, in part because the Government failed to provide the necessary foundation for

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
OF MOTION TO DISMISS

1 the admission of evidence regarding radar detection equipment.  
2 Further, the Government failed to establish that the 25 mph speed was  
3 mounted at the necessary right angle to the road it purported to  
4 regulate. Failure to comply with the Manual on Uniform Traffic  
5 Devices requirements warrants the dismissal at the close of the  
6 Government's case. As to the expired registration, Sgt. K failed to  
7 testify as to the results of any Department of Licensing check that he  
8 ran. Failure to Obey an officer was subject to a Rule 29 motion  
9 because, at the end of the Government's case, viewing the evidence in  
10 the light most favorable to the Government, there was insufficient  
11 evidence to convict Mr. Bosworth of a wilful failure to obey an  
12 officer, by pulling over into a well-lit parking area within a quarter  
13 of a mile of the inception of the stop. It is Mr. Bosworth's position  
14 that he fully complied with the provisions of the statute, and that he  
15 did obey the officer's direction to stop, and that the evidence at  
16 trial supports his position that his conduct does not constitute a  
17 violation of Washington statute R.C.W. § 46.61.021.

18 The speeding and expired tabs offenses are the subject of a  
19 motion to dismiss on the ground that the basis for jurisdiction, the  
20 Assimilated Crimes Act, does not apply to traffic infractions. As  
21 noted by The Government, the initial speeding citation was dismissed,  
22 and the Government proceeded by way of an Information filed on June  
23 15, 2007. That information erroneously asserted the basis for  
24 jurisdiction as the assimilated crimes act, 18 U.S.C. § 13. The  
25 Government now concedes that it does not have jurisdiction to proceed

1 under the Assimilated Crimes Act for the infractions. See  
 2 Government's Jurisdiction Briefing at 2, line 2. However, it appears  
 3 that the Government now attempts to rescue itself from the  
 4 jurisdictional challenge asserted at trial, by asserting that there is  
 5 an alternate basis for jurisdiction. The Government acknowledges that  
 6 the separate mechanism for federal jurisdiction contains notification  
 7 provisions that were not shown at trial, but asserts that the  
 8 Defendant failed to argue lack of notice and therefore must assent to  
 9 the Government's new theory of the case.

### 11 Analysis

#### 12 **1. The Government does not have jurisdiction under the Assimilated** 13 **Crimes act to bring traffic infractions in Federal Court.**

14 The Government concedes that 18 U.S.C. § 13, the assimilative  
 15 crimes act, does not provide jurisdiction over offenses designated by  
 16 the State of Washington as infractions because in sum infractions are  
 17 not crimes. The Ninth Circuit has confirmed this in United States v.  
 18 Carlson, 900 F.2d 1346, 1349 (9th Cir.1990).

19 First it should be noted that the Government seems to be of the  
 20 opinion that the defense claimed that the jurisdictional issue applied  
 21 to all of the offenses. The defense motion regarding jurisdiction  
 22 applies only to the speeding and the expired tabs offenses because  
 23 they are infractions. The Government concedes that speeding is an  
 24 infraction because it is not excluded from the list of decriminalized  
 25 traffic offenses that appear in RCW 46.63.020. The Government argues

1 that because RCW 46.16.021 is contained in the list of offenses that  
2 are excluded from decriminalization that the expired tabs is a  
3 criminal offense and is therefore assimilated under 18 U.S.C. § 13.  
4 The Government is mistaken that expired tabs or registration is not a  
5 traffic infraction.

6 RCW 46.63.020(6) does in fact exclude RCW 46.16.021 from the  
7 traffic offenses that are decriminalized in Washington. It excludes  
8 "RCW 46.16.010 relating to the nonpayment of taxes and fees by failure  
9 to register a vehicle and falsifying residency when registering a  
10 motor vehicle." A close examination of RCW 46.16.010 reveals that not  
11 all of the offenses covered under that section are failure to register  
12 a vehicle or falsifying residency.

13 The specific portion of RCW 46.16.010 that was the basis for the  
14 charge against Mr. Bosworth was expired registration under  
15 46.16.010(3) which reads "Failure to renew an expired registration  
16 before operation on the highways of this state is a traffic  
17 infraction." Expired registration is therefore an infraction and is  
18 not assimilated by 18 U.S.C. § 13.

19 The Government then asserts an alternative basis for jurisdiction  
20 Under C.F.R. §634.25 and C.F.R. 210.3(b). The Government's argument  
21 has been rejected by other courts. In U.S. v. Boyer 935 F.Supp. 1138  
22 (D.Colo.,1996), the magistrate court held that the notice requirements  
23 were an essential element of the charge and that because the  
24 Government had not provided sufficient evidence that the posting  
25 requirements were met the defendant's motion to dismiss was granted.

1 Posting under 32 C.F.R. § 634.25 must be in "a prominent place  
2 accessible to persons assigned, living, or working on the  
3 installation." 32 C.F.R. § 634.25(f).

4 There was no evidence offered at trial concerning where the  
5 regulations were posted. There was some attempt by the Government to  
6 introduce evidence that Sgt. Klosterman knew of the Memorandum  
7 concerning regulations on the base that the Government attempted to  
8 introduce at trial. However, even if this Memorandum had been admitted  
9 it would not satisfy the posting requirements. C.F.R. § 634.25(f)  
10 requires that an "extract copy of this paragraph (f) and a copy of the  
11 delegation memorandum in DODD 5525.4, enclosure 1, will be posted..."  
12 Id. Clearly there was no discussion of where the copy of paragraph (f)  
13 of this C.F.R. was posted at trial, because the Government was unaware  
14 of its existence.

15 Further C.F.R. § 634.25(g) provides that if the Federal  
16 Government's Jurisdiction authority is only proprietary, that traffic  
17 offenses cannot be enforced at all on the basis of State law. There  
18 was no evidence presented at trial regarding whether or not the  
19 Federal Government's jurisdiction was only proprietary. Therefore even  
20 if the C.F.R.'s could provide jurisdiction over these offenses, a  
21 factual basis for the exercise of that jurisdiction must be offered  
22 into evidence in the Government's case in chief. There was no such  
23 evidence offered.

24 How the Government asserts jurisdiction is important. Under the  
25 assimilative crimes act, the offenses could only be punished in the

1 manner authorized by State law. 18 U.S.C. § 13(a). The offenses being  
2 infractions, Washington law authorizes only a fine. Under C.F.R.  
3 jurisdiction the offenses would be punishable by imprisonment for up  
4 to 30 days. C.F.R. 634.25(f). Mr. Bosworth would be prejudiced by  
5 allowing the Government to alternate between theories of jurisdiction  
6 without notice.

7 Even if the C.F.R.'s could provide jurisdiction over the  
8 infraction offenses, there are factual predicates that must be met  
9 before jurisdiction under the C.F.R.'s can be asserted. No facts  
10 supporting this jurisdiction were offered at trial. Because the motion  
11 challenging jurisdiction was made pursuant to rule 29 of the federal  
12 rules of criminal procedure, no additional facts can now be offered to  
13 support jurisdiction. "If the court reserves decision, it must decide  
14 the motion on the basis of the evidence at the time the ruling was  
15 reserved." Fed. R. Crim. Pr. 29.

16 The only basis for jurisdiction that the Government notified Mr.  
17 Bosworth would be at issue is jurisdiction under the assimilative  
18 crimes act. Mr. Bosworth would be prejudiced by allowing the  
19 Government to alternate jurisdictional theories in the same way the  
20 defendants in Carlson and Boyer were. Mr Bosworth respectfully request  
21 that the motion to dismiss be granted.

**Conclusion**

Based upon the foregoing analysis, it is Mr. Bosworth's position that this matter must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

DATED: February 3, 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Kraig Gardner, 31935  
Attorney for ANTHONY BOSWORTH  
Federal Defenders of Eastern  
Washington and Idaho  
306 East Chestnut Avenue  
Yakima, Washington 98901  
Telephone Number: (509) 248-8920  
Fax Number: (509) 248-9118  
kraig\_gardner@fd.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 3, 2008, I electronically filed the Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following: Stephanie Whitaker, Assistant United States Attorney.

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
OF MOTION TO DISMISS

1  
2 s/Kraig Gardner  
3 Kraig Gardner, 31935  
4 Attorney for ANTHONY BOSWORTH  
5 Federal Defenders of Eastern  
6 Washington and Idaho  
7 306 East Chestnut Avenue  
8 Yakima, Washington 98901  
9 (509) 248-8920  
10 (509) 248-9118 fax  
11 Kraig\_Gardner@fd.org  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
27 OF MOTION TO DISMISS